



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,523	01/23/2004	Byung-rae Lee	Q79369	5359
23373 7590 05/12/2008				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, NIRAV B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2135				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/12/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/762,523

**Applicant(s)**

LEE ET AL.

**Examiner**

NIRAV PATEL

**Art Unit**

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2008 (Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on Jan. 30, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 17 and 24 are amended by the applicant.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1, 8, 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Safadi (US Pub. No. 2003/0126086).

As per claim 1, Safadi discloses:

a server, wherein if the server receives multimedia contents from one of a plurality of DRM server groups having a unique DRM solution respectively [Fig. 1], the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents, converts the received multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet and transmits the converted multimedia contents to the client [Fig. 1, paragraph 0017, 0021, 0023, 0026, 0028].

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 8, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 17, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 24, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-4, 9-11, 18-20 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi (US Pub. No. 2003/0126086) and in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080).

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Russ teaches the converted multimedia contents are encrypted and transmitted to the client [Fig. 3, col. 16 lines 9-13, 64-67, col. 17 lines 1-7].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russ with Safadi, since one would have been motivated to provide security and control concerns for the operators of the subscriber network system [Russ, col. 2 lines 11-13].

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

the server translates a license received through the Internet to be suitable for the client of the intranet and additionally transmits the translated license to the client [Fig. 3, 7, col. 21 lines 21-65].

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

the translated license is encrypted and transmitted to the client [Fig. 3, 7, col. 21 lines 21-65].

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

As per claim 25, the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 26, the rejection of claim 25 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 3. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

As per claim 27, the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

4. Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi (US Pub. No. 2003/0126086) in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080) and in view of Fransdonk (US Patent No. 7,228,427).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 2 or 4 is incorporated and Russ teaches the encryption is performed using a key [col. 20 lines 11-20].

Fransdonk teaches the encryption is performed using a group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fransdonk with Safadi and Russ, since one would have been motivated to distribute and deliver the content via a communication network securely [Fransdonk, col. 1 lines 30-32].

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 18 or 20 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

5. Claims 6, 7, 12, 16, 22, 23, 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi (US Pub. No. 2003/0126086) in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080) and in view of Hans et al (US Patent No. 7,200,575).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

request a license for multimedia contents from a corresponding DRM server group which provides the multimedia contents [Fig. 1, col. 10 lines 48-50]; a content conversion unit operable to decrypt multimedia contents received from the corresponding DRM server group, and converting the decrypted multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for the client; and a license translation unit operable to translate a license received from the corresponding DRM server group into a license having a format suitable for the client [col. 3, 7, col. 15, lines 34-44, col. 21 lines 21-65].

Hans teaches: the server comprises a plurality of proxy managers constructed according to DRM server groups [Fig. 1-3], and performing registration of the client [Fig. 4 col. 5 lines 60-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hans with Safadi and Russ, since one would have been motivated to manage the access to the digital content and control the distribution of digital content [Hans, col. 1 lines 6-7, 48-49].

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Hans teaches:

a report/billing unit operable to arrange multimedia content usage details of the client, and to transmit the arranged multimedia content usage details to the DRM server group, and to transmit information relating to billing [Fig. 3, 4, 5].



As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and Russ teaches:

a content decryption unit operable to decrypt the multimedia contents which are encrypted and transmitted; and a rights management unit operable to decrypt the license which is encrypted and transmitted, and to check whether the decrypted multimedia contents are executed in the client to be suitable for the decrypted license [Fig. 9 col. 16-67].

Hans teaches: an authentication and access control unit operable to perform registration of the client on the server and access to the server [Fig. 4, 5].

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and Hans teaches:

a report unit for reporting usage details of the transmitted multimedia contents to the server [Fig. 3-5].

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 7. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 7. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

As per claim 28, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 12. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 12 above.

As per claim 32, the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 16. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 16 above.

6. Claims 13-15 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi (US Pub. No. 2003/0126086) in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080) in view of Hans et al (US Patent No. 7,200,575) and in view of Fransdonk (US Patent No. 7,228,427).

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and Russ teaches the encryption is performed using a key [col. 20 lines 11-20].

Fransdonk teaches the encryption is performed using a group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fransdonk with Safadi, Russ and Hans, since one would have been motivated to distribute and deliver the content via a communication network securely [Fransdonk, col. 1 lines 30-32].

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 13. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 13 above.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 13 or 14 is incorporated and Fransdonk teaches the decryption is performed using a client key corresponding to the group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50].

As per claim 29, the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and Russ teaches the encryption is performed using a key [col. 20 lines 11-20].

Art Unit: 2135

Fransdonk teaches the encryption is performed using a group key of the server [Fig. 2, col. 17 lines 49-50].

As per claim 30, the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 14. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 14 above.

As per claim 31, the rejection of claim 29 or 30 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 15. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 15 above.

As per claim 33, the rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and Hans teaches said client key is assigned to register DRM smart clients through the platform authentication and access control unit [Fig. 3, 5].

### **Response to Amendment**

7. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 17, 24 which necessitated new ground of rejection. See rejection above.

### **Conclusion**

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lockhart et al (US 6944776) – System and method for data fights management; Tso et al (US 6892226) – System for delivery of dynamic content to client device; Clark et al (US 6704733) – Distributing electronic books over a computer network; Chang et al (US 6963972) – Method and apparatus for networked information dissemination through secure transcoding.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5936. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

*NBP*

5/6/08

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135